REMARKS

Claims 7-20 and 27-40 have been rejected (claims 1-6 and 21-26 were previously cancelled). In this response, claims 7 and 27 are amended and claims 13 and 32 are cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112" on page 3 of the above-cited Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 27 and its dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have amended independent claim 27 to overcome such rejections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

1. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103" on page 4 of the above-cited Office Action, claims 7-14 and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,484 (hereinafter Martin) in view U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0059347 (hereinafter Shaffer). However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 13 and 32 are cancelled, which renders their rejections moot.

Independent claim 7 recites a method comprising:

> "identifying, by a computing device, a format of a binary file generated by a source application;
>
> selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file; and
>
> processing, by the computing device, the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications, to enable viewing of the user interface displays independently of the source application;
>
> wherein each user interface display specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other user interface display specifications."

Thus, when properly read as a whole, amended claim 7 stands for a method through which a binary file (e.g. a Microsoft (MS) Word document) may be processed so that the representation of user interface displays of the binary file can be viewed independently of the source application (e.g. MS Word, for the example of a MS Word document) which generates the binary file. Specifically, the binary file is processed to generate the user display specifications specifying the end user displays when the content of the binary file is viewed using the source application. Further, the user interface display specifications include transition rules governing transitions between user interface displays associated with the processed results of the binary file.

The Examiner cites col.9, lines 63-67 to col. 10, lines 1-10 and col. 11, lines 47-51 of Martin to read on "processing, by the computing device, the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications, to enable viewing of the user interface displays independently of the source application" in claim 7.

In these cited portions of Martin, it is described that an image file (601) which captures the displayed visual representation of an electronic document (607) is generated and a copy (619) of data of the stored image file (601) may be combined with a viewer code (621) to form a self-contained executable application (623). And, the self-executable application may be received by other users to view the stored image file without any additional specialized software.

Even if, assumed arguendo that, the electronic document (607) may be deemed as the binary file in claim 7, and the image file (601) may be deemed as a graphical representation of user interface display, the viewer code which is associated with the image file in Mark cannot read on the user interface specification in amended claim 7. This is because the viewer, as the plain meaning of the term, as understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, is an application itself, designed to view image files. Such viewer typically includes forward, backward, zoom in, zoom out type of features. Features such as Forward, Backward are displays independent. Typically, in response to a Forward/Backward, the viewer simply replaces a current image with the next sequential successor/predecessor image. Thus, Mark's teaching of the employment of a viewer teaches away from the invention, and fails to teach or suggest the recited end user

specifications, which includes transition rules governing the transitions between the end user displays, as recited in amended claim 7. So, Mark fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 7.

Shaffer page 2, paragraph [0025] is cited as teaching "identifying, by a computing device, a format of a binary file generated by a source application" and "selecting, by the computing device, a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file" as recited in claim 7. But, Shaffer fails to cure the above-stated deficiency of Martin. Therefore, the combination of Martin and Shaffer fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 7.

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Martin and Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Amended independent claim 27 includes in essence the same recitations as amended claim 7. Therefore, due to at least similar reasons, claim 27 is also patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 8-12, 28-31 and 33 depend from claims 7 and 27, incorporating their recitations respectively. Therefore, due to at least the reasons stated above claims 8-12, 28-31 and 33 are also patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

2. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103" on page 4 of the above-cited Office Action, claims 15, 18-20, 35 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Shaffer. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claim 15 recites a computer implemented method comprising:

> "receiving, by a computing device, an email message including an associated first attachment of a first attachment type;
>
> determining, by the computing device, whether said first attachment type is associated with a member of a group of one or more supported source applications;
>
> selecting, by the computing device, a set of one or more user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one or more supported source applications;
>
> launching, by the computing device, a locally accessible version of the associated source application;

simulating, by the computing device, one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications; and

capturing, by the computing device, output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment independently of the associated source application."

Thus, when read as a whole, claim 15 recites a method through which a representation of an e-mail attachment can be generated for viewing of the attachment independently of its source application. In particular, user inputs are simulated and output responses are captured to facilitate generation of such a representation of the attachment.

The Examiner cites Shaffer page 2, paragraph [0025] (according to the context of the above-identified Office Action, "Martin pg.2, par 0025" is understood as referring to Shaffer rather than Martin, because Martin is not identified in accordance with page numbers and paragraph numbers.) The cited paragraph teaches analyzing the attachment of an email based on its suffix, selecting an associated application for the attachment and opening the attachment with the application. But nowhere does Shaffer or Martin teach or suggest "simulating, by the computing device, one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications" or "capturing, by the computing device, output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment independently of the associated source application" as recited in claim 15.

Further, Applicants submit that there would have been no motivation to modify Shaffer to achieve the undisclosed features of claim 15. The purpose of Shaffer is to automatically load associated application programs to open email attachments. There is no need to simulate user input and capture outputs since the user may utilize the select associated application program to open the attachment directly. So, incorporating the undisclosed feature of claim 15 does not contribute to the purpose of Shaffer. Therefore, there would have been no motivation to modify Shaffer to achieve claim 15.

Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Independent claim 35 recites in essence the same elements as claim 15. Therefore, due to at least the same reasons stated above, claim 35 is also patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 18-20 and 38-40 depend from claims 15 and 35, incorporating their recitations respectively. Therefore, due to at least above stated reasons claims 18-20 and 38-40 are also patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

3. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103" on page 9 of the above-cited Office Action, claims 16-17 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Shaffer and further in view of common knowledge. In particular, the Examiner states that the MIME protocol recited in these claims is well known at the time that the invention was made. However, such common knowledge does not cure the above-stated deficiency of Martin and Shaffer. And claims 16-17 and 36-37 depend from claims 15 and 35, incorporating their recitations respectively. Therefore, due to at least the same reasons stated above, claims 16-17 and 36-37 are patentable over Martin in view of Shaffer and further in view of common knowledge about MIME protocol under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: May 27, 2008

/Robert C. Peck/
Robert Peck
Registration No. 56,826

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-796-2099